DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 746 EA 020 680

AUTHOR Fenton, Ray; And Others
TITLE The Effects of Three Models of Teacher Supervision: Cooperative, Supervisor Controlled, and Minimal.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Models; Practicum Supervision; Questionnaires; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Anchorage School District AK

ABSTRACT

This paper recounts the development of a cooperative teacher evaluation system by the Anchorage (Alaska) School District and presents the data that led Anchorage educators to conclude that cooperative evaluation is superior to either traditional supervisor-directed evaluation or minimal unstructured evaluation. In 1984, the district formed a task force under the direction of an assistant superintendent and composed of principals, teachers, and other professionals to explore alternative evaluation systems. After a year of evaluating varied models, the group developed its own unique system of cooperative evaluation with goals jointly defined by supervisor and instructor. The plan called for a 3-year commitment to developing and assessing this new cooperative evaluation process. Evaluation of the three models was based on questionnaires sent to participants and structured interviews conducted by Anchorage School District Assessment and Evaluation Department staff. Data on the effects of cooperative evaluation are presented through a series of two tables focusing on assessment of teachers and of supervisors, respectively. A bibliography is included, along with instrumentation from the assessment. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304746

THE EFFECTS OF THREE MODELS OF TEACHER SUPERVISION:

COOPERATIVE, SUPERVISOR CONTROLLED AND MINIMAL

RAY FENTON
FRED STOFFLET
TOM STRAUGH
MEG DuRANT

ANCHORAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION DEPARTMENT
4600 DEBARR ROAD
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99515

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ray Fenton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

An Anchorage School District Assessment and Evaluation Department Report prepared for presentation to Division A of the American Educational Research Association (A.E.R.A.) convention at San Francisco, CA held March 27-31, 1989.

EA020680

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT IS THE BEST POSSIBLE TYPE OF TEACHER EVALUATION?

This question was asked and potential answers debated in the Anchorage School District in 1983. The search for an answer led to the development and adoption of a new approach to teacher evaluation which emphasizes participation and personal growth without rating individuals on arbitrarily pre-determined categories. This paper recounts the development of a cooperative evaluation system and presents the data which led Anchorage educators to conclude that cooperative evaluation is superior to either traditional supervisor directed evaluation or minimal unstructured evaluation.

The current thinking on teacher evaluation systems is fairly represented in Sarah Stanley and W. James Popham's Teacher Evaluation: Six Prescriptions for Success published in 1988 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. The themes developed by the various contributors to the volume cover the issues which were fought (thought) through as the Anchorage system evolved. These issues include the need for a system which will allow the identification and elimination of bad teachers; the need for a system which will improve the quality of instruction; the need for a system which will be fair and satisfying to the participants; the need for a system which will reflect and encourage diversity and personal development; and, the need to encourage the cognitive and personal development of teachers. Anchorage resolved to emphasize the development of teachers and instruction with the standard evaluation system and leave the identification and documentation of incompetence to a separate procedure which would only be applied when an individual was identified as a potential candidate for dismissal.

The motivation for the search for an improved system of evaluation grew out of a general feeling that the approach which had been in place for more than a dozen years in Anchorage had become a mere formality. At best, the annual completion of a 12 item evaluation checklist by the principal seemed to provide an opportunity for a supervisor to give a teacher some praise and recognition. At worst, it was a demonstration of the capricious application of the authority of the principal which resulted in an alienation of teachers. The old checklist system seemed to provide few useful insights for teachers, little instructional improvement for students, an no overall improvement of the district instructional systems through the encouragement of experimentation and innovation on the part of teachers. It was strongly felt by some administrators that an evaluation process should be used to encourage both the personal and professional growth of teachers and that the supervisor controlled checklist based system used in Anchorage did neither.

Under the supervisor directed system every teacher in the school district was subjected to an evaluation each year as required by Alaska state law and Department of Education regulation. Each supervisor was required to complete a 12 item checklist (Attachment A). Experienced principals often would add written comments that either elaborated on the undefined items of the checklist or provided positive comments about activities not covered by the form. There was no specific set of evaluation activities specified though many principals regularly made classroom visits and provided leadership in encouraging teachers to expand their instructional skills. A few of the principals, mostly younger principals who had recently completed their own training, used systematic observation systems and made regular classroom visits a part of their evaluation activities.

Many principals would hold a brief end-of-year evaluation conference with teachers to discuss the evaluation and the activities of the year. However, some would simply put the completed checklist in the teacher's school mailbox with a note asking that the form

be signed and returned. If a teacher disagreed with the evaluation, the teacher would be allowed to write a statement that could be appended to the form when it was submitted to the personnel office. No face-to-face interaction was required so long as the performance of the teacher was rated as acceptable and many teachers had little active evaluation.

In cases where the teacher was rated as being in need of improvement, the principal was to provide the teacher with assistance to improve in the area of weakness identified. No provision was made for any further assessment of performance and no specific review or reporting procedures were specified beyond the general admonition to work with the teacher to develop a plan for improvement. It was only in cases where a teacher was identified as a potential case for dismissal that principals were encouraged to document the performance of the teacher, to closely monitor the teacher's behavior, and to make regular and repeated observations of activities in the classroom.

Teachers were dissatisfied with the system because they felt that they were not being evaluated on their teaching activities. Many teachers also felt that the checklist items were not defined and not appropriate for a professional evaluation where observation and judgment should be stressed. Many supervisors were dissatisfied with the system because they felt the sterile checklist provided them with little opportunity for acting as leaders who could have a positive effect on instruction. Some of the principals had initiated a training program to improve their own skills and the skills of their colleagues in observation, documentation of instructional behavior, and holding conferences with teachers.

In 1984 the district formed a task force under the direction of an assistant superintendent and composed of principals, teachers, and other professionals to explore alternative evaluation systems. The goal of the group was to produce a new approach to evaluation for the district. Elementary and secondary teachers represented more than half of the thirty member group. The remainder included principals, an education researcher, a special education supervisor, a representative of the principal's union, the president of the teacher's union, a staff development specialist, and a member of the personnel department.

A year was spent evaluating such varied models as clinical supervision, collegial supervision, peer supervision, developmental supervision, supervision cycles, accountability, models of teaching, and the various factors that had been reported by McGreal (1983) and others (See Sergiovanni, 1982.) to effect successful evaluation. A con-census emerged from the group that good evaluation was based on a positive, trusting, communicative relationship between a supervisor and a teacher who were involved with each other in working toward the common goal of improved instruction.

An important concept crystalized during this year of study, thought, debate, and developing commitment. The task force came to believe that the process of evaluation was less important than the development of a supportive relationship where a teacher and supervisor would work together to improve the performance of a teacher in the classroom. The evaluation process was identified as the context which would bring together the teacher and supervisor into a cooperative relationship. The development of a systematic procedure to enhance such a supportive relationship became a major effort for the committee but the goal was not so much to develop a system of evaluation as it was to develop and improve a professional relationship for a specific purpose.

The view of teachers and principals that emerged from the group was very positive. It saw teachers and principals as individuals who had come to education to work for the good of children, who shared common desires for professional and adult treatment, and who for the most part were effective in their work. It was felt that there was little need for a system which was punitive or fault finding and a great deal of need for a system which would build on the already existing qualities and interests of the participants.

The system which evolved as the format for evaluations was not specifically modeled on any one evaluation system which had been discussed by the committee. It has many of the elements identified by the authors who contributed to Teacher Evaluation: Six Prescriptions for Success but is a unique system evolved by a working committee within a school district. It purposefully included some of the characteristics of successful supervision (McGreal, 1983) and an overall emphasis on purposeful and goal directed interaction targeted on instructional activities.

The checklist approach was eliminated by the committee in favor of a cooperative and goal driven system with a specified series of conferences and observations. The heart of the new system was that evaluation would be limited to a cooperative effort where specific aspects of instruction would be jointly identified and developed with each teacher. As long as the general performance of the teacher was not deficient, evaluation would only take place relative to a goal or goals specified jointly by the teacher and principal. Even the preparation of the final evaluation document to be provided to the personnel department would be a cooperative act based on a partnership between supervisor and teacher.

The activities of the new evaluation process were to follow the progression of the school year. The new annual evaluation process would begin with a goal setting conference/conferences early in the school year; the result would be written goal statements prepared by the teacher and accepted by the principal. During the course of the year, the principal would make at least three observations and at least two of these were to be jointly scheduled. Each planned observation would be preceded by a meeting to discuss the instructional activity to be observed, the type of observation, and the record keeping or documentation to be done by the supervisor. Following each observation, a debriefing conference would be held so that the principal could report what was observed and a joint assessment could be made of the documentation and the instructional effort relative to the goal identified early in the year. Toward the end of the school year, the principal and teacher would have a formal meeting to assess the progress made toward the goal or goals specified at the beginning of the year. The product of this final conference would be a joint statement which would be forwarded to the personnel office.

Since new ground was being broken and both principals and teachers had to adjust themselves to a new relationship, a phased implementation with a planned evaluation developed. The plan called for a three year commitment to the development and assessment of the new cooperative evaluation process.

- Year 1 was to be a very limited test to assess the feasibility of a goal driven and cooperative system.
- Year 2 was to be a more general test with all supervisors using the system with a small group of experienced teachers while continuing the supervisor directed system with most staff members.

- Year 3 was to be a full scale implementation for all teachers and supervisors.

The year 1 pilot of the Cooperative Evaluation System was made with a dozen volunteer principals who recruited tenured teachers to participate. Supervisors kept time logs and observation records. An outside evaluator experienced in collaborative assessment was asked to review the system and meet with the volunteers prior to the beginning of the pilot and at the end of the school year. Structured interviews were conducted with principals and teachers to probe the fairness of the system, the efficacy of the system, and the attitudes of the participants towards this new evaluation system.

All indications for the first year were positive. Teachers and principals felt this approach resulted in better performance in the classroom by teachers, a more collegial relationship between teachers and supervisors, and some instructional innovation on the part of the teachers who were encouraged to try new content and instructional techniques. Both teachers and principals reported that they had spent about twice as much time involved in evaluation under the new cooperative model. The estimated time involvement was substantiated by the time logs kept by supervisors. Goal development sessions, pre-conferences, observations, post-conferences, and final evaluation conferences were found to take more than a dozen hours with each evaluated teacher or about eight weeks of full time effort in the average Anchorage elementary school if all teachers were evaluated with the cooperative approach each year.

The one major caution of the outside evaluator was that the first year, 1984-85, pilot had been done under the best of conditions. The principals and volunteers were experienced staff who felt little or no threat from the evaluation process and for the most part felt that there was a need for improvement of the process. There was also an understanding among the participants that this might be a one time experiment where failure would be attributed to the system rather than to the individual. The outside evaluator who conducted in depth interviews with participants as well as district administrators responsible for evaluation characterized the first year pilot as success in a "green house" (Goldsberry, 1985). Suggestions were made for the documentation of the process and the development of materials and guidelines which would facilitate a more general implementation the following year.

A set of formal directions and forms for the Cooperative Evaluation System evolved over the course of the two year pilot (Attachment B). The final directions required that at least one goal be related to observable instructional behavior which would serve as the basis for conferences and observations. The observation form was developed at the request of some of the principals; its use was not mandatory. The set of "instructional competencies" was developed as a guide for discussing areas of potential improvement and as an aid in the goal setting process.

The Anchorage School Board approved the full-scale implementation of the new process for the 1985-86 school year. As the time factor had been identified during the pilot as a crucial variable, the evaluation process was modified so that tenured teachers, more than 80% of the teaching staff, would be evaluated with the Cooperative Evaluation System every other year. Tenured teachers who were not receiving a cooperative evaluation would be observed as needed. Principals would only be expected to make a statement at the end of the year that the performance of the teacher had been satisfactory and to indicate the basis for that judgment.

Approximately 225 administrators and 2400 teachers in more than 100 programs participated in the year 2 pilot during 1985-86. Administrators and staff members

were given training in the evaluation process at the start of the school year. Participants from the year 1 pilot project and members of the committee which developed the evaluation system helped to introduce the model in all schools. Principals were provided with the additional opportunity to participate in advanced training sessions on goal setting, conducting conferences, and methods of classroom observation. Short in-services were held on goal setting, observation methods, and record keeping for teachers at most schools.

During this first year of a district-wide implementation of the Cooperative Evaluation System, principals were only required to use the new approach with a minimum of five teachers and to allow a corresponding number of teachers to participate in minimal evaluations. Non-tenured teachers were not given the minimum supervision alternative. When most teachers found that an alternative to the checklist system was available, they sought to participate in the cooperative system. This resulted in far more that the minimum of five teachers per school actually participating in the cooperative and minimum supervision alternatives during year 2 of the pilot.

The district now had three models to evaluate. The cooperative model allowed both teacher and principal to develop instructional goals through a conferencing process, with structured observations and end-of-year consensus as to goal outcome. The supervisor controlled model was the traditional system used by the district, where a checklist was completed by the principal. The supervisor controlled model often included unannounced classroom observations and could include an end-of-year meeting. The minimum supervision model allowed for tenured teachers who were not being formally evaluated for a particular year to work under general supervision without observations of conferences.

Evaluation of the three models were based on a combination of questionnaires sent to participants and structured interviews conducted by Anchorage School District Assessment and Evaluation Department staff. Questionnaires were sent to teachers and principals close to the end of the school year and one week after the deadline for returning evaluations to the Anchorage School District Personnel Department. District Assessment and Evaluation Department staff made regular visits to schools, met with teachers and principals for discussions of the evaluation process, and collected and summarized survey data. The teachers were asked to complete the Survey of Supervisory Practices (Lee Goldsberry, Paulette Harvey, and Nancy Hoffman, 1984) which had been developed for their research on the effects of different types of supervision.

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THE COOPERATIVE EVALUATION APPROACH?

Since the participants had some control over the evaluation in which they participated, there must be some caution in the interpretation of the findings from the second year of implementation of the Cooperative Evaluation System. Conversations with principals and teachers suggested that principals and supervisors tended to use the cooperative model with teachers whom they felt needed the most supervision and the minimum supervision model with more experienced teachers who had proven their ability. There were also teachers who were less than trustful of a new evaluation system and opted for the supervisor controlled model with which they were familiar. Very few of the teachers or principals voiced any substantial concerns or reservations during the course of the year though many of the teachers who participated in interviews with Assessment and

Evaluation Department staff stressed that trust of the principal was the important factor which would determine the success of any cooperative system.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used to analyze all survey data (SPSS-X, 1983). Analysis was done by the Assessment and Evaluation Department of the Anchorage School District on the Anchorage School District VAX computer systems.

A brief questionnaire and the Survey of Supervisory Practices, Teacher's Form, were sent to a sample of 1,000 teachers in May, 1986. Usable returns came from 512 teachers (51% of the sample). The district questionnaire asked teachers to identify the type of evaluation they experienced and to indicate whether or not they considered their evaluation to be fair. More than 92% of those reporting each type of evaluation felt that their own evaluation had been fair.

Among other things, the Survey of Supervisory Practices asks teachers to select from a list of adjectives those terms which they feel characterized the supervision which they received during the school year. Table 1 indicates the frequency with which teachers participating in the three evaluation alternatives selected the various adjectives. Each descriptor is listed, the total number of teachers selecting the descriptor is indicated, and the percent selecting the descriptor from each of the three groups is indicated. The differences in the characterizations inherent in the patterns of selected adjectives in Table 1 were also reflected in the interviews held with teachers.

Table 1
Effect of Cooperative Evaluation
Teacher Assessment
1985-86

Descriptor	Total Selecting N = 521	Cooperative Model N = 294 Percent Selecting	Supervisor Controlled Model N = 54 Percent Selecting	Minimum Evaluation Model N = 173 Percent Selecting
Continuous	229	47.6	40.7	38.7
Collaborative	260	57.5	38.9	40.5
Threatening	30	6.1	5.6	1.7
Rational	198	40.8	27.8	36.4
Arbitrary	41	6.8	9.3	9.2
Meaningful	268	58.5	50.0	39.9
Constructive	316	68.4	64.8	46.2
Supportive	406	79.3	87.0	72.8
Discouraging	37	7.5	5.6	6.9
Disorganized	45	7.8	5.6	11.0
Stimulating	127	27.9	27.8	17.7
Useless	44	6.8	7.4	11.6
Intuitive	68	13.6	18.5	10.4
Encouraging	330	69.0	64.8	53.2
Systematic	153	35.4	25.9	20.2
Destructive	13	2.4	1.9	2.9
Uniform	104	20.7	18.5	19.1
Productive	259	57.8	44.4	37.6
Sporadic	78	15.0	13.0	15.6
Boring	19	4.4	1.9	2.9
Directive	125	27.6	29.6	16.2
Varied	91	17.0	16.7	18.5
Organized	232	50.0	33.3	38.7
Trivial	40	8.2	5.6	7.5

Some of the descriptors stand out as important for all three of the groups and reflect the positive aspects of any good evaluation. Those that differentiate the cooperative, minimal, and supervisor controlled approaches generally favor the cooperative approach. The cooperative approach was more often identified as organized, productive, systematic, and collaborative. Interestingly, supervisor directed approach was chosen by a larger proportion of that group as supportive. The minimal evaluation approach without specified goals, conferences, or observations had fewer descriptors chosen and in no case had a larger positive proportion than either one of the other two approaches.

The descriptor selected most often of all by all three groups was "supportive." It was selected by 42% of the supervisor controlled model teachers, by 24% of the collaborative model teachers, and by 21% of the minimum evaluation system teachers.

The second most selected descriptor was "collaborative." This descriptor was identified by 6 % of the supervisor controlled model teachers, by 25% of the collaborative model teachers, and by 12% of the minimum evaluation system teachers.

Other *Survey of Supervisory Practices* items revealed interesting differences. Cooperative model teachers were more likely to see the purpose of evaluation as "to assist me to improve my teaching" (51%) while those of the other two groups most often selected the response "to comply with legal requirements that I be observed". Teachers in the cooperative group were more likely to initiate supervisor observations (45%), as opposed to teachers in supervisor controlled (29%) or minimum evaluation groups (22%). Teachers in the supervisor controlled evaluations were also much more likely to think that the supervisor was unaware of the purpose of the lessons they were teaching (58%) than either the minimum evaluation teachers (40%) or the cooperative model teachers (13%).

Perhaps the most important finding is that there was a notable difference among the groups when looking at the relation of the evaluation process to the exploration of instructional innovations in the classroom. Sixty-four percent of the teachers in the cooperative model reported that innovations were tried. Innovation was reported by 51% of the teachers in the minimum evaluation group and by only 44% of the teachers in the supervisor controlled group. Of those changes in instruction which were discussed with supervisors and then were tried out in the classroom, 62% of the cooperative model teachers found them to be worthwhile, 41% of the minimum evaluation system teachers found them valuable, and 40% of the teachers in the supervisor controlled evaluation group reported the innovations to be worthwhile. This is a critical finding if it is our belief that the supervisor should play an effective role in the introduction and encouragement of instructional innovation.

Teachers were asked the degree to which they agreed to various statements about their supervisors. Examination of Table 2 shows that there is statistical significance in the differences among the three evaluation systems in their effect on the perception of the supervisor. Even though most of the absolute differences in average responses do not appear to differ greatly, it may be that the differences are great enough to help explain the prior finding of increased innovation.

Teachers ranked their supervisors on a scale which ranged from strongly agree, 1, to strongly disagree, 5. The most positive responses were from teachers who participated in the Cooperative Evaluation System and the least positive responses were from teachers in the minimum evaluation system. Teachers in the cooperative group on the average found their supervisors to be more helpful, to give clearer comments, to be more helpful to their personal growth, and to be more interested in the achievement of students. Teachers under the supervisor controlled model found their supervisors to be the least helpful, the least likely to encourage innovation, and less likely to encourage their personal growth. The overall average for teachers who participated in cooperative evaluations is 1.96. The averages for those in supervisor directed evaluations and minimal evaluations are 2.18 and 2.15 respectively. This shows that under all three conditions there is an overall positive reaction to supervision though the differences are large enough to be statistically significant ($F = 8.345$, d.f. = 3, $p < .000$).

Table 2
Effect of Cooperative Evaluation
Teacher Assessment of Supervisor
1985-1986

Question	Average Old Sys. N = 48	Average New Sys N = 287	Average Minimal N = 155	F	Significance
Supervisor was knowledgeable.	1.97	1.78	1.85	1.026	.359
Supervisor had a grasp of my goals.	1.91	**1.70**	1.88	5.059	.007
Supervisor was not helpful to me.	4.02	**4.24**	3.96	3.800	.023
Supervisor got me to think about new methods.	2.64	**2.35**	2.56	3.656	.027
Supervisor did not observe me enough to make a good judgement.	**3.25**	3.80	3.19	13.625	.000
Supervisor helped me to grow as a professional.	2.83	2.71	2.79	.423	.655
Supervisor monitored my student's achievement.	2.87	2.70	2.82	.883	.413
Supervisor emphasized my student's achievement.	2.51	**2.48**	2.85	5.695	.003
Supervisor did not make clear comments on my evaluation.	3.91	4.02	**3.75**	3.288	.038
Supervisor did not identify specific areas of weakness on my evaluation.	3.62	3.70	3.62	.332	.717
Supervisor did give me helpful comments.	2.52	2.42	2.67	1.618	.201
Supervision was helpful to me as a teacher.	2.40	**2.26**	2.67	7.501	.001
In-services were not related to evaluation.	**3.06**	3.41	3.14	4.390	.012
I welcome observations by other teachers.	2.02	**1.69**	1.88	4.284	.014

The most serious questions raised by Table 2 result from the responses of the minimum supervision group. The averages for this group showed that these teachers, not surprisingly, found supervisors to have less knowledge of teacher goals and student achievement. They also felt that their supervisors were generally less helpful to the professional growth of teachers and personal development. These all relate to goals which were important to the committee which developed the Cooperative Evaluation System and reveal a real cost to the teacher-supervisor relationship in the every-other-year approach to cooperative evaluation.

HOW WELL IS A COOPERATIVE EVALUATION SYSTEM ACCEPTED WHEN IT IS MANDATED FOR ALL TEACHERS?

Year 3 of the pilot brought an implementation of the Cooperative Evaluation System in all Anchorage School District programs. The new cooperative system became the system of evaluation for use by more that 230 supervisors and 2400 teachers and no teachers were allowed to choose the less personal checklist based evaluation system.

Non-tenured teachers and teachers who had been evaluated via the minimum evaluation system the previous year had to participate in cooperative evaluations in 1986-87. Tenured teachers who were in the supervisor controlled model had either cooperative or minimum evaluations unless they were being considered for dismissal. Those teachers who had cooperative evaluations in 1985-86 year were placed in the minimum valuation system unless either they or their principal requested a continuation of the evaluation to continue working on a goal left incomplete at the end of the year.

Evaluation in 1986-87 again included structured interviews and school visits by the Assessment and Evaluation Department staff followed by an end of the year questionnaire. The questionnaire was again timed to follow the completion of evaluations for the year.

In May 1987 a questionnaire developed by the Assessment and Evaluation Department which included some items from the *Survey of Supervisory Practices* was sent to a sample of 500 teachers. Usable questionnaires were returned by 248 teachers, a return rate of 49%. One hundred and forty-one surveys were returned by teachers in the cooperative evaluation group (57% of the return), and 101 were returned by teachers in the minimum evaluation group.

This questionnaire focused on the perceptions of participants about their experience with cooperative and minimum evaluations. There were some notable differences in the responses of the two groups of teachers.

Of those participating in the cooperative model, 77% reported three or more conferences with supervisors. Sixty-six percent reported three or more classroom observations. By contrast, 74% of the teachers in the minimum evaluation system reported two or fewer conferences and 64% of the teachers reported two or fewer observations by supervisors. Seventy-six percent of the cooperative model teachers and 60% of the minimum evaluation teachers reported that they had tried new teaching methods. Sixty-five percent of the cooperative group and 54% of the minimum evaluation group felt that they had made worthwhile changes in their teaching. Ninety-one percent of the cooperative group felt that their evaluations had been fair and accurate, an additional 4% felt that their evaluations were overly positive. This compares with 89% of the minimum evaluation group who felt their evaluations were fair and accurate and an additional 1% who felt their evaluations to be overly positive.

Again, the Cooperative Evaluation System was found to be the more positive choice. However, it was evident that supervisors had not given up on the evaluation of those in the minimum evaluation group. Substantial numbers of teachers who participated in the minimum evaluation condition reported an amount of supervisory contact close to that experienced the prior year by those participating in a supervisor controlled system. It also appeared that the difference in treatment between the cooperative evaluation and minimal evaluation were not as great as they had been in the more selective trial the prior year.

A sample of fifty principals was sent a questionnaire asking for reactions to the cooperative and minimum evaluation approaches. Questionnaires were returned by 47 supervisors (97% return rate). The group was composed of four senior high principals, nine junior high principals, and 33 elementary school principals. The average principal supervised a staff of 44 and reported that they conducted from 10-15 of each type of evaluation during the year. Principals reported fewer observations than teachers, with two or three observations taking place with 98% of the teachers in the cooperative model and only one observation taking place with most (63%) of the minimum evaluation teachers. Principals estimated that 75% of the cooperative model observations were 45 minutes or more, and 77% of the minimum evaluation observations were 30 minutes or less. A final evaluation conference time of less than 30 minutes was reported for 53% of the cooperative model teachers and for 82% of those in the minimum evaluation group.

Principals and supervisors rated the overall quality of the cooperative evaluation system as it was implemented in 1986-87. It was rated as excellent by 23% of the supervisors, good by 47% of the supervisors, fair by 12% of the supervisors, and poor by 4% of the supervisors. Those who rated the system poor or fair often commented that they did not have enough time to do a good job or that they did not have the resources they needed to support teachers attempting to fulfill instructional goals in areas where the supervisor had no experience. Some thought that it was unrealistic to expect principals to play an active part in instructional innovation which required specific technical knowledge.

No detailed time log data was collected during year 3 of the evaluation. However, the principals estimated that they were spending about twice as much time with the cooperative evaluation teachers. Interviews supported this but showed that some principals were spending time in evaluation like visits and discussions even if they were working with teachers in the minimal evaluation condition. The principals who were attempting to provide cooperative evaluations for designated staff and maintain their same level of contact with other staff members frequently felt that the new system was difficult and a problem because of the time required. Those who reduced their contact with teachers who were not targeted for Cooperative Evaluation System evaluations felt less of a problem.

CONCLUSION

This study has reported on the implementation of a cooperative evaluation system developed by principals and teachers in the large, urban public school system of Anchorage, Alaska.

The system is consistent with much of the current thinking in the area of supervision (Sergiovanni, 1982; McGreal, 1983; Stanley and Popham, 1988) but the system is

unique in that it was developed within the context of a school district and implemented through a phased implementation which was able to demonstrate the superiority of a cooperative system over a more traditional supervisor controlled system or minimal evaluation.

The system is based on a model where supervisors and teachers jointly set instructional goals and work together to improve instruction. The teacher is primary in setting goals while the supervisor provides encouragement and monitors progress through a series of conferences and observations. At the end of the school year, the principal and teacher meet to produce a joint document which assesses the success of the teacher in reaching these goals. This mutually prepared document is forwarded to the Personnel Department to be included in the teacher's personnel file.

This procedure was a radical departure from the supervisor controlled evaluation system which had been in use for many years. Under this old model, the principal completed a 12 item checklist to rate a teacher's performance as either acceptable or in need of improvement. Teachers complained that the old system was not related to instruction and did not fairly reflect their teaching activities at attempts to improve. Supervisors were dissatisfied with the system because they felt the sterile checklist provided little opportunity for linking their role as instructional leaders with the evaluation process.

Anchorage School District administration committed themselves to the development of an improved system of evaluation and created an environment where potential innovations could be explored and a new system of evaluation developed. A group of teachers, supervisors, central office administrators, and other educational professionals developed a new cooperative system.

A year long initial pilot study by 12 principals and volunteer teachers showed that the cooperative approach was workable under ideal conditions but that the required time commitment was approximately double that of the old supervisor controlled model.

A revised system was implemented in over 100 program locations by approximately 225 administrators and 2400 teachers. Some teachers had cooperative evaluations and some had supervisor controlled evaluations. The increased time required by the cooperative model was gained by allowing tenured staff to be evaluated every other year.

The implementation of the new system allowed the Anchorage School District Assessment and Evaluation Department to conduct a large scale examination of the effects of evaluation under three conditions: cooperative evaluation, supervisor controlled evaluation, and minimal evaluation.

The results favor a cooperative system. Surveys of principals and teachers show substantial support for the Anchorage Cooperative Evaluation System. The Survey of Supervisory Practices Teacher's Form (Goldberry, Harvey, and Hoffman, 1984) as well as district developed instruments were used to assess and contrast the three conditions of evaluation.

Supervisors and teachers favored the cooperative evaluation mode and reported that it resulted in increased instructional innovation on the part of teachers. Teachers who participated in cooperative evaluations were more likely to describe their evaluation as organized, productive, systematic, and collaborative than teachers who participated in either supervisor directed or minimal evaluations. However, teachers who participated

in the supervisor directed evaluation process were more likely to characterize their evaluation as supportive.

Teachers felt that supervisors who they had worked with in cooperative evaluations were more likely to participate in the evaluation process because of a desire to help improve teaching than to simply fulfill a legal requirement. This was reflected by other survey items which showed that more teachers and principals in the cooperative relationship came up with instructional innovations and that they more often successfully implemented those innovations than the teachers who participated in either minimal or supervisor directed evaluations.

Teachers in the cooperative relationship were more likely to feel that their supervisor was knowledgeable about their goals, was more helpful, made enough observations to make a good judgment of instruction, and placed a greater emphasis on student achievement. When the average ratings of teachers of the practices of their supervisor in 12 areas were compared, the ratings of those who had participated in cooperative evaluations were higher than those of minimal or supervisor directed evaluations.

Cooperative evaluation has its limitations as a form of teacher evaluation but three years of data on one districts attempt to improve instruction through the introduction of a cooperative evaluation system strongly support cooperation as superior to supervisor directed or minimal evaluation. Only time and additional assessment of the cooperative approach will show if it continues to result in positive principal-teacher relations and to encourage innovation in the classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfonso, R. J. "Will Peer Supervision Work?" *Educational Leadership* 34 (May 1977): 594-601.

Alfonso, R. J.; Firth, G. R.; and Neville, R. F. *Instructional Supervision: A Behavior System.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Alfonso, R. J. and Goldsberry, L. "Colleagueship in Supervision." In *Supervision of Teaching*, pp. 90-107. Edited by T. J. Sergiovanni. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Apelman, M. "Working with Teachers: The Advisory Approach." In *Improving Teaching*. pp. 115-129. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986.

Association of Teachers. *Teacher Assessment.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators, 1988.

Bernstein, H. T.; Darling-Hammond, L.; McLaughling, M. W.; and Wise, A. E. *Teacher Evaluation A Study of Effective Practices.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1984.

Blumberg, A. *Supervisiors and Teachers: A Private Cold War.* 2nd ed. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1980.

Buttram, J. L. and Wilson, B. L. "Promising Trends in Teacher Evaluation." In *Educational Leadership.* pp. 4-5. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 1987.

Brandt, R. "On Teacher Evaluation: A Conversation with Tom McGreal." In *Educational Leadership.* pp. 20-24. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Development, April 1987.

Capie, W.; Anderson, S. J.; Johnson, C. E.; and Ellett, C. D. *Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments: A Handbook for Interpretation.* Atlanta, GA: State Department of Education, 1979.

Carroll, J. G. "Faculty Self-Evaluation." In *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, pp. 180-200. Edited by J. Millman. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981.

Cogan, M. L. *Clinical Supervision.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Doll, R. C. *Supervision for Staff Development: Ideas and Application.* Rockleighm, NJ: Allyn and Bacon, 1983.

Educational Research Service. *Teacher Evaluation: Practices and Procedures.* Arlington, VA: ERS, 1988.

Eisner, E. W. "An Artistic Approach to Supervision." In *Supervision of Teaching*, pp. 53-66. Edited by T. J. Sergiovanni. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Ellett, C. D., Capie, W. and Johnson, C. E. "Assessing Teacher Performance." In *Educational Leadership.* pp. 219-220. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1980.

Florida Coalition for the Development of a Performance Measurement System. *Domains: Knowledge Base of the Florida Performance Measurement System.* Chipley, FL: Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative,1983.

Freiberg, H. J. *Teacher Self-Evaluation and Principal Supervision.* April 1987.

Glatthorn, A. *Differentiated Super Vision.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Glatthorn, A. and Holler, R. "Differentiated Teacher Evaluation." In *Educational Leadership.* pp. 56-58. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 1987.

Glickman, C. D. *Developmental Supervision: Alternative Practices for Helping Teachers Improve Instruction.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

Goldsberry, L. F. "Reality - Really?" In *Educational Leadership.* pp. 10-11. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 1984.

Goldsberry, L. F. "The Realities of Clinical Supervision." In *Educational Leadership.* pp. 12-15. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 1984.

Goldsberry, L. F. Personal Communication: Reporting Evaluation of Anchorage Cooperative Implementation for 1984-85. 1985.

Goldhammer, R. *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

Grimmett, P. P. and Crehan, E. P. "A Study of the Effects of Supervisors' Intervention on Teachers' Classroom Management Performance." British Columbia, Canada: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, 1987.

Harris, B. N. *Supervisory Behavior in Education.* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Johnson, D. and Johnson R. "On Cooperation in Schools: A Conversation with David and Roger Johnson." In *Educational Leadership.* pp. 14-19. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, November 1987.

Joyce, B. R. and Showers, B. *Power in Staff Development Through Research on Training.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Krajewski, R. J. "No Wonder It Didn't Work." In *Educational Leadership.* p. 11. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 1984.

Kramer, M. J. *Applying the Characteristics of Effective Schools to Professional Development.* Southport, CT. Connecticut Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 1980

McFaul, S. A. and Cooper, J. M. "Peer Clinical Supervision: Theory vs. Reality." In *Educational Leadership* . pp. 4-9. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 1984.

McGreal, T. L. *Successful Teacher Evaluation.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

McNeil, J. D. "A Scientific Approach to Supervision." In *Supervision of Teaching,* pp. 18-34. Edited by T. J. Sergiovanni. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. *Guidelines for Performance Based Teacher Evaluation in Missouri.* Jefferson City, MO: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1984.

O'Shea, L. J. "The Supervision Throughout Model: Interpersonal Communication Skills and Problem-Solfving Procedures for Effective Intern Supervision." *Teacher Education and Special Education.* pp. 71-80. Spring 1987.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective.* Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1987.

Smith, W. F. and Andrews, R. L. "Clinical Supervision for Principals." In *Educational Leadership.* pp. 34-37. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, September 1987.

Stanley, Sarah H. and Popham, W. James *Teacher Evaluation: Six Prescriptions for Success.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1988.

Thorson, J. R., Miller, R. K., and Bellon, J. J. "Instructional Improvement Through Personnel Evaluation." *Educational Leadership.* pp. 52-54. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 1987.

Tye, K. A. and Costa, A. L. *Better Teaching through Instructional Supervision: Policy and Practice.* Sacramento, CA: California School Boards Association, May 1987.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. and Bernstein, H. *Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1984.

Zumwalt, K. K. "Working Together To Improve Teaching." In *Improving Teaching,* pp.169-185. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986.

APPENDIX A

THE SUPERVISOR DIRECTED EVALUATION FORM

ANCHORAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Teacher_____ School_____

Assignment_____ Tenure_____ Non-Tenure_____

It is the philosophy of the Anchorage School District that all employees -- even the best employees -- can improve performance, and it is the primary goal of the professional evaluation to assist in improving performance generally and the level of instruction in particular. Therefore, a "plan for improvement" notation in one or more areas of the evaluation form does not necessarily indicate unsatisfactory performance.

Note: Similarly, area(s) of exceptionality will be narratively reported below.

			Continued Development Encouraged	
		Plan for Improvement	Proficient	Exceptional
1.	AREAS OF INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCY			
A.	Knowledge of Subject	( )	( )	( )
B.	Diagnostic & Prescriptive Assessment	( )	( )	( )
C.	Learning Environment	( )	( )	( )
D.	Instructional Methods and Planning	( )	( )	( )
E.	Motivation of Students	( )	( )	( )
F.	Classroom Social Interaction	( )	( )	( )
G.	Evaluation of Student Performance	( )	( )	( )
H.	Student Decorum	( )	( )	( )
2.	OTHER PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS			
A.	Interpersonal Relations	( )	( )	( )
B.	Non-Instructional Duties and Responsibilities	( )	( )	( )
C.	Curriculum and Non-Curricular Activities	( )	( )	( )
D.	Professional Growth	( )	( )	( )

APPENDIX B

THE COOPERATIVE EVALUATION DIRECTIONS AND EVALUATION REPORT FORM

ANCHORAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Appraisal Philosophy

The parents, School Board members and staff of the Anchorage School District are committed to the continuation and improvement of the District's strong educational program. An effective teacher appraisal system that focuses on the improvement of instruction is an essential component of this instructional program.

While the primary focus of evaluation is to improve instruction, teacher appraisal encourages teachers to meet the established performance expectations. Performance expectations should be established by principals and their staffs prior to the appraisal process. The appraisal process needs to be continuous and constructive and needs to take place in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. The process is a cooperative effort on the part of supervisors and teachers. It is designed to encourage productive dialogue between staff and supervisors and to promote professional growth and development.

Procedural Guidelines

The Anchorage Teacher Appraisal System will be made up of two related but separate parts.

A. A major part of the appraisal system should focus on instruction and improved student learning. The supervisor and staff member share the responsibility for the completion of this part of the appraisal procedure. Four specific activities are included in this part of the appraisal:

1) The collaborative development of specific teaching or job related goals and plans of action for achieving the goals is necessary. Areas of focus may be drawn from competencies as outlined in Appendix D.

2) The teachers shall be given an opportunity to provide a self-evaluation of their work and are encouraged to do so.

3) The plan is implemented by the teacher with the supervisor's assistance.

4) An evaluation by the supervisor of the progress achieved on the goals is to be completed.

B. An integral part of a teachers employment in the School District is an on-going and continuous appraisal of the staff member's ability to meet general professional responsibilities (see Final Teacher Appraisal Form, Appendix A, Part I). The appraisal of these professional responsibilities will typically be made through a supervisor's routine contact, informal observations, and interaction with the staff member.

If problems occur, the staff member will be contacted by the supervisor to remind the staff member of minimum expectations in the problem area and to provide whatever assistance might be helpful.

If the problem continues or reoccurs, the supervisor, at his or her discretion, may prepare and issue to the staff member a written notice setting forth the specific deficiency with specific recommendations for improvement with a copy to the teacher's personnel file.

In the unlikely event that serious, intentional, or flagrant violations of the general professional responsibilities occur, the supervisor, at his or her discretion, may put aside the recommended procedure and make a direct recommendation for more formal and immediate action.

Procedures

1. Appraisal of General Professional Responsibilities

   A. All tenured and non-tenured staff will be evaluated on the professional responsibilities as outlined in the Final Teacher Appraisal Form (see Appendix A, Part I) on an annual basis. Evaluation of professional responsibilities will be completed by February 15 for non-tenured, certificated personnel and by May 15 for tenured, certificated personnel.

2. Appraisal of Instruction

   A. All non-tenured staff will be involved in the focused instructional improvement process (see Appendix A, Parts I and II) each year which shall be completed by February 15.

   B. All tenured staff will be involved in the focused instructional improvement process on alternate years (see Appendix A, Part II). This appraisal will be completed by May 15. Participation will be determined by the supervisor. Staff members will be informed by October 1 of the intent to provide focused instructional appraisal; however, an evaluation may occur at a later date, if warranted. Staff members may request an instructional appraisal in any given year. The supervisor may choose to continue this instructional appraisal process for a selected staff member from one year to the next. The supervisor is encouraged to limit these evaluations to fourteen or less staff members in a given year.

C. The focused instructional improvement process should be initiated as early in the year as possible, preferably by October 15. The basic components of this process include:

1) Orientation

a. General orientation to the teacher appraisal system for all teaching and administrative staff

b. Individual follow-up orientation for evaluatees

2) Process

a. Establish goals (see Appendix E) and a plan of action for achieving the goals -- preferably before October 15 (see Appendix A, Part II).

1. Determine methods for collecting data relative to the goals

2. Provide written description of the goal setting conference

b. Frequent formal classroom observations should occur throughout the school year. These observations should occur at different times of the year and the day. Records of the interactions and contact between supervisor and staff member should be kept.

1. A pre-observation conference is recommended for each formal classroom observation to help the teacher and supervisor determine the primary focus of the observation. At least one pre-observation conference prior to an observation will be required during the appraisal period. (For suggested questions see Appendix B.)

2. At least two formal classroom observations will occur during the appraisal period. At least one observation should be by teacher invitation and at least one observation will include the review of an entire instructional lesson/period. (See Appendix C).

3. Feedback, written and verbal, should occur within one to five working days after each formal observation. On at least two occasions this feedback will take the form of a post observation conference. Information determined in the observation and pre-observation conference will form the basis of discussion in the post conference.

c. Portfolio

Teachers, if they wish, are encouraged to provide as optional and supplementary, a portfolio of favorite and/or exemplary unit plans, lesson plans, tests, quizzes, study guides, homework assignments, etc. Teachers are also encouraged to include student, peer and parent feedback. Portions of this portfolio may, by mutual agreement, be referred to or included in the appraisal report.

3) Final Appraisal Conference

The final appraisal conference must be held by the end of the appraisal period (second week in February for non-tenured staff and the second week in May for tenured staff). It is the concluding activity in the formal appraisal process, and should be a time when the supervisor and the staff member discuss and analyze Appendix A, Parts I and II of the final teacher appraisal activity. The highlight of the conference should be the joint discussion of the year's activities, and the implications for future goal setting and continued self growth. The written summary should be done during the conference or immediately afterward. The summary should be a clear reflection of the discussion during the conference and must be shared with the staff member for his/her signature and optional comments.

kj
SM16.46

INSTRUCTIONAL PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE

Purpose

A pre-observation conference is recommended for each formal classroom observation. The purpose is to provide the teacher and the supervisor an opportunity to review the teacher's instructional plan for the scheduled observations. The teacher and supervisor will determine the primary focus of the observation and review the procedures the supervisor will use while observing. The pre-observation conference should also be used to establish feedback mechanisms that will occur during the post-observation conference. The pre-observation conference should occur from 1 - 3 days before the formal observation.

Points to consider during the conference:

Several instructional points should be reviewed during the conference. These might include the following:

- What are the lesson objectives? What should the students know or be able to do after the lesson?
- Where is the teacher in the course and how does the lesson fit District Scope and Sequence?
- What methods will the teachers utilize to present the lesson? What kind of activities will the student be asked to do?
- How will the teacher know if the students have learned the new concept or skill?
- Are there particular items within the lesson that the supervisor should examine more carefully, i.e. time on task, clarity of input, equality of questioning, etc.?

TEACHER COMPETENCIES

The following statements are desired characteristics for teachers in the Anchorage School District. THE LIST OF COMPETENCIES ARE NOT TO BE USED AS A CHECKLIST OF REQUIRED PRACTICES. Selected items under each category may be utilized to assist the supervisor and staff member in selecting appropriate target goals.

Diagnosis/Evaluation of Students

Keeps accurate and adequate records of student progress.
Effectively communicates student progress (positive or negative) to students, parents and appropriate administrators.
Utilizes appropriate evaluation techniques.
Diagnoses students and provides for individual differences.
Recognizes developmental levels of students.

Planning

Plans all student contact time.
Identifies long range goals.
Designs clear logical lessons to achieve long range goals.
Sets appropriate learning expectations and standards.

Instruction

States the objective of the lesson.
Relates the lesson to what has come before and to what will follow.
States how the learning is of practical use for the student.
Focuses student attention for learning.
Motivates students for learning.
Clearly presents information to the learner.
Correctly models the learning.
Uses multiple examples and/or non-examples.
Uses questioning strategies that promote learning.
Checks for learner understanding.
Maximizes teaching & learning time.
Incorporates a variety of methods and materials to assist the many learning styles of students.
Relates student activities to lesson objectives.
Allows adequate practice without penalty of given skill.
Elicits overt (observable) behavior in all students in order to check for understanding.
Monitors and, if necessary, adjusts instruction based on student feedback.
Provides or elicits summary of the learning.
Provides an opportunity for students to practice the learning.

Interpersonal Skills

Establishes relationship with students, colleagues and parents which is based on mutual respect and acceptance.
Shares responsibilities, ideas and resources for the common goal of assisting pupil growth.
Is flexible and cooperative with colleagues, administrators, parents and students.
Is accessible to students and parents.
Promotes positive self-concept in students.

Professional Qualities/Personal Traits

Exhibits positive attitude towards profession.
Demonstrates proficiency in written & oral communication.
Keeps abreast of new developments in educational field.
Evaluates own performance.
Is receptive to constructive suggestions.
Maintains good grooming & personal care.

Knowledge of Subject Matter

Demonstrates a knowledge base for subjects taught.
Maintains up-to-date knowledge of relevant scope and sequence.
Demonstrates an enthusiasm for subjects being taught.

Management

Classroom

Establishes clearly defined behavior standards which are appropriate for the developmental stages of students.
Models appropriate behavior standards.
Consistently applies reinforcement theory, taking individual needs into account.
Establishes and implements efficient and effective classroom routines.

Physical setting

Organizes physical setting to facilitate desired instruction.
Organizes student groups which promote good working relationships.
Maintains orderly, safe environment.
Utilizes appropriate materials and equipment.
Promotes and maintains a positive environment conducive to learning.

Other Responsibilities

Completes plans, reports, records, and requisitions timely, neatly and in a professional manner.
Demonstrates responsibility in meeting time requirements of the contracted teaching day.
Performs non-instructional duties as requested (e.g., recess, hall, detention, study).

GOAL SETTING

Both the supervisor and the staff member have a responsibility to make the goal setting conference as productive as possible. The supervisor, while still maintaining ultimate responsibility for the final product, must actively involve the staff member in the conference. In most instances the final goals should be the outgrowth of a cooperative activity. (In working with non-tenured staff, the supervisor will normally assume a more directive role in goal setting. With tenured staff, the supervisor's major functions would tend to be as a clarifier and a facilitator. Obviously, in those few instances where agreement cannot be reached, the supervisor does maintain final responsibility.) The staff member and the supervisor have the responsibility of coming to the conference prepared to openly and positively discuss those areas that are of particular concern and interest to them. Both parties share the responsibility of approaching the conference and the entire activity with a positive attitude and a willingness to fully participate. By both parties being willing to view the process as a growth oriented, cooperative venture, the success and usefulness of the system is significantly enhanced.

Number of Goals

The number of goals established between the staff member and the supervisor is less important than the form and substance of the goals. In most cases, the number would range between one and three, with the number being determined by the relevancy and the time and energy required.

Measurability of Goals

Several of the options for measuring progress towards the goals are outlined in the procedures (section b, Appraisal Period) in the Teacher Appraisal System. The key to this activity during the conference is a cooperative effort between the supervisor and the staff member in arriving at a method that fits each goal. Certain goals may be so unique that they force the supervisor and staff person to creatively design a method for assessing progress. This is perfectly acceptable. It is to be remembered that subjective judgments made by the supervisor and the staff person after the method(s) have been applied are clearly acceptable forms of measurement. This allows us not to have to confine our goals to only those things that are measurable by traditional, empirical standards. Goals may be accomplished in less than a year. They should be an on-going process. As a goal is achieved, another one may be established. A goal may also be carried over to the succeeding year. Each goal should have designed timelines with key steps outlined.